

V. REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Sugimoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,287,195). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claim 1 is to configure the ridgeline angles β and γ for the pair of projection parts 110L and 110R to be different with each other (see Fig. 7).

The Office Action states that side walls of Sugimoto (US'195) may be at a different height, and this causes two separate horizontal angles to be formed by a single horizontal reference line.

However, it is respectfully submitted that forming two side walls in different heights would not necessarily cause the angles β and γ be different with each other, and that Sugimoto fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of claim 1.

In brief, Sugimoto fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach an angle between a ridgeline of one of the projection parts and a horizontal line is configured to be different from an angle between a ridgeline of the other projection part and the horizontal line as recited in claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the United States Patent and Trademark Office has failed to establish that the applied art identically describes each and every element of the claimed invention.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the United States Patent and Trademark Office fails to establish other claimed features, to wit:

In claim 2, the United States Patent and Trademark Office fails to show that the angle between the ridgeline of one of the projection parts and the horizontal line is larger than the angle between the ridgeline of the other projection part and

the horizontal line.

In claim 3, the United States Patent and Trademark Office fails to show that a height of a start point of the ridgeline of one of the projection parts on a side of the opening is configured to be the same as a height of a start point of the ridgeline of the other projection part on the other projection part on a side of the opening.

In claim 4, the United States Patent and Trademark Office to show that an angle between an upper face of the frontward projection portion and the horizontal line is configured to be substantially equal to the angle between the ridgeline of the other projection part and the horizontal line.

In claim 5, the United States Patent and Trademark Office fails to show that an angle between the horizontal line and a line connecting a top of one of the projection parts and a bottom of the one of the projection parts is configured to be smaller than an angle between the horizontal line and a line connecting a top of the other projection part and a bottom of the other projection part.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, Applicants assert that there are also reasons other than those set forth above why the pending claims are patentable. Applicants hereby reserve the right to submit those other reasons and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein in future papers.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.


Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this

paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 20, 2007

By:



Carl Schaukowitch
Reg. No. 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s): Amendment Transmittal
 Petition for Extension of Time (one month)

DC265108.DOC